

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

A DRI ICA TIONI NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.		Naoya Hashimoto	Q65157	2909
09/892,845	06/28/2001	Nabya Hasimiloto		
75	90 09/13/2002			
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS			EXAMINER	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			PEREZ, GUILLERMO	
Washington, Do	C 20037		,	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	. `
			DATE MAILED: 09/13/2002	. 11)
				. •

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	114
	09/892,845	HASHIMOTO ET AL	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Guillermo Perez	2834	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a rinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment whic il (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	h places the applica	ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (continued)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The e date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the ma	HE FINAL REJECTION. FR 1.136(a) and the appount of the fee. The appount of the fee. The appount or the final configuration of th	See MPEP ropriate extension propriate extension I Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal (eriod set forth in of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by		· NOTE : : `	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth		(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	orially raduaing as a	implifying the
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	nnally rejected clair	iio.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: S	See Continuation Sneet.		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims to	nt(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or would be rejected is provided be	b)∐ will be entered low or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			minor
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on			mulici.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem 10. Other:	Si	CESTOR CAMP	CEZZ COMOTOMER UT 2800
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office			10

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the fact that the prior art uses the same structural material to solve a different problem does not make it different from the claimed invention. There must be some structural difference othe than the advantage found in the material to make the claims allowable. The applicants explain in the specification that the means to prevent the problem they are addressing is thermosetting resin, and the prior art disclose thermosetting resin used in the winding to solve a different problem. It is still the same structure.